

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
HATTIESBURG DIVISION**

A.D. MILLS

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:09cv107-KS-MTP

RONALD KING, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the court *sua sponte* upon receipt of documents and information produced by Defendants in response to the Scheduling and Case Management Order [34].

Specifically, the court ordered Defendants to produce the names of the Security Threat Group (“STG”) Committee members as of January 21, 2009, and the STG Disruptive Core policy to the court under seal. The STG Disruptive Core policy is classified as a “restricted” policy by the MDOC.

Having had the opportunity to review *in camera* the STG Disruptive Core policy and the names of the committee members, the court finds that production of the STG policy is not necessary for the prosecution of Plaintiff’s claims. Moreover, this policy has been identified as a “restricted” policy by the MDOC, and jail officials are entitled to wide deference in matters regarding prison security. *See Green v. Polunsky*, 229 F.3d 486, 489 (5th Cir. 2000) (“When reviewing the policies of prison officials, we do so with deference, keeping firmly in mind the difficult task before them in fulfilling valid penological interests-including deterrence of crime, rehabilitation of prisoners, and institutional security.”) (internal citations and quotations omitted). Accordingly, Defendants need not produce the policy to Plaintiff.

The court further finds that it is unnecessary to produce the names of the STG committee members to Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s claim that he is improperly classified as a STG member is

already before the court.¹ The court finds it unnecessary to add additional individuals to this lawsuit at this time based on the Plaintiff's allegations. Accordingly,

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED:

1. That Defendants are not required to produce the Security Threat Group policy to Plaintiff; and
2. That the Defendants are not required to produce the names of the STG committee members to Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED and ADJUDGED this the 19th day of January, 2010.

s/ Michael T. Parker

United States Magistrate Judge

¹The court in no way concludes that this claim is meritorious.